



Charter Review Commission (CRC) Regular Meeting Minutes May 27, 2021

1. Call to Order - 10:03am

1a. Land Acknowledgment

2. Roll Call: All CRC members present except Bill Appel & Liz Lafferty

Members of the Public: Amy Vira, Steve Ulvi, Carl de Boor, Randy Gaylord, Michelline Halliday, Ben Bama, Alexandra Gayek, Lauren Stephens, Minor Lile

3. Approve Minutes from May 25th & May 26th meetings:

May 25 - Adopted.

May 26 - Adopted with one correction from Dave Anderson: The issue of strong governance was actually brought to all candidates of the CRC. The subject was brought to the full CRC by a letter from the League of Women Voters.

4. New Business

1. Process Committee:

Process Committee presented on its last item - Bob presented and described the committee's process on finalizing the "Declaration of Community Values".

The findings have been passed on this, but will submit those again to make sure.

Motion by Bob, seconded by Anne Marie to adopt the Declaration of Community Values as a full slate.

Discussion, including:

- Kevin: If this is put off to 2022, there's still an opportunity to have further discussion about slight edits and where to put it in the Charter.
- Maureen called the question.

Vote: 14 in favor, 2 abstentions (Tony & David D) - **Motion carried.**

5. Review of all approved motions

Review of Proposals Put Forward – went through the list to make sure nothing was missing.

Proposed Amendments:

- 1) Initiative & Referendum - Patty:

One additional thing approved yesterday about paid signatures - **should be included and could be combined**. All 3 were very similar, so potential to combine them.

Kevin: **Conversation to be had with the Prosecuting Attorney.**

2) Governance - Dave A:

a) Oversight of role of County Manager - oversight of county government - to work with the Auditor in forming the budget. **Can be combined** because both dealing with the role of County Manager.

b) **Missing one about onboarding** of members of committees and boards - personnel and Justice & Equity Committee - ensuring a process for onboarding and searching for people to serve on these committees, with diversity. **Dave to get that language to Kathryn. Those 3 could be combined as well.**

Kevin: **Looking for Dave's thoughts on this – Prosecuting Attorney's office will tell us which can be combined.**

Jane (chat): That 'Governance' issue related to onboarding is NOT under Justice and Equity in this table. Dave will need to get the language for that. Bullying language is in Justice & Equity Committee.

3) Elected v. Appointed - Maureen: Term limits **should** be on there.

4) Climate & Environment - Anne Marie: The language proposed by the C&E Committee is included.

5) Operations - Paul, Patty, Maureen:

Public Records and Public Advocate are the two issues they agreed to.

Maureen: Exemption of Election Officials and Language relating to bullying towards commissions and boards are not here, but they don't need them here because they're dealt with elsewhere.

(Tom left the meeting)

6) Process - Bob:

Preamble – adopted.

Definition for "Nature" - **not yet assigned to Megan to do bit of research to make sure it works.**

Kevin: That's not a priority right now - let's circle back on that.

Bob: Budget process for future commissions - passed by CRC.

Declaration of Community Values and findings for that - passed today by CRC.

Kevin: So, 3 amendments, 1 tabled amendment ("Nature"), and 1 recommendation.

7) Justice & Equity - Jane:

Some wording is correct, some is not

Kevin: **Wording on spreadsheet can be updated in next 24 hours** – now we want to make sure the list is comprehensive - that amendments are all on this list.

Jane:

- a) Nondiscrimination – correct.
- b) Establishing Justice, Equity & Inclusion Commission.
- c) Article 8, Sect. 8.10 - Relating to SJCC re personnel system - how changes to it are approved.
- d) Article 8, Sect. 8.20 - Relating to language around exemptions of individuals from personnel system and 2 additional clauses proposed to clarify that.
- e) Article 9, Sect. 9.21 – Relating to Charter Review Commission functioning - proposed language change re vacancy of commissioners from meetings.
- f) Article 2.0, 2.60 - Proposing a sentence be added related to values of Diversity, Equity & Inclusion are upheld in SJCC appointments.

Kevin asked Dave to get the language on Justice & Equity and Governance regarding boards & committees - can combine those. Dave - that's under Miscellaneous Appointments.

g) Relates to Acknowledgment of Coast Salish peoples, land & waters - **Proposed Amendment - she needs to ensure that the language is correct.**

Kevin asked all committee leads to make sure the language is correct in the spreadsheet.

8) Elections - Tony:

Ranked Choice Voting (RCV) is the only proposed amendment.

Kevin counted 20 amendments (not including recommendations) - specified how many from each committee. Some can be combined, in consultation with the Prosecuting Attorney's office. This is why our deadline of early June is so important - it will take the PA's office some time.

We need to finalize the language - working with Kathryn over the next days. We would need motions on each recommendation from the full CRC. Some of these make sense to combine, some can easily be combined.

Jane is working on a separate table to help our Executive Committee meeting.

Kevin: **Thursday, June 3 will be the next meeting of the full CRC.** We will be able to summarize at the Town Halls - function is to hear from the public, yet present enough so people get a sense of our work and what we're proposing.

List of Recommendations:

1) Justice & Equity - Two recommendations: 1st concerning membership & composition of Law & Justice Council - 2 recommended actions; 2nd concerns functioning of Law & Justice Council. Can be combined as one recommendation.

2) Governance:

a) Tourism Master Plan - breadth

b) Prioritizing seasonal housing

c) Move Visitors Bureau to county government - not sure that's how we passed it - thought we only passed one recommendation.

Janet thinks they voted on one recommendation as 3 parts....

Maureen said there were 3 votes.

Janet said those were the 3 parts.

David D: Voted to create a department to manage tourism activities.

Janet: Voted that it be moved inside - no longer contracted outside the county - that it was moved inside the county government.

Kevin: We have this in record and will clarify this. Asked them to make sure the language is correct and get that to Kathryn.

3) Elections:

To go to the Auditor's office to instruct the Elections Department on the ballot reviewing process, to make it easier for observers to observe the ballot process from start to finish - adopted by the CRC.

4) Process - Bob: SJCC to recognize the Declaration of Community Values and work toward meeting it. This should go to all elected officials and department heads, not just to the SJCC.

Kevin: The Executive Committee will work off this list and come back with a recommendation.

(Tony left the meeting)

Kevin asked the committee leads (or a lead on an issue within a committee) to send him a couple of bullet points on what they would like summarized from their committee to tell the public, and how they want that framed.

(Dave A left the meeting)

3. Kevin: Wants to discuss Qualifications for Electeds again – we'll do that after the town halls.

6. Town Hall prep

(a) Discussion about work of Executive Committee in prep for Town Halls:

Kevin: We shouldn't rush things through - should consider splitting the proposed amendments over two years.

We can take a bit of a break in June. Proposes meeting twice a month between then and the fall to prioritize the other issues that in Dec we would put forward for the 2022 ballot. Need to make a decision on that.

Then Executive Committee will take a first crack on what is going to be on the ballot this year and bring that back to the full CRC.

Timeline - deadline for Auditor to have everything from the CRC is August 3, 2021.

Our timeline gives the Prosecuting Attorney a full month to really have back-and-forth with the CRC to make sure we get it all right.

Discussion, including:

Motion by David D, seconded by Tom, to split the amendments over two years (2021 & 2022) and authorize the Executive Committee to analyze all the CRC's proposed amendments, prioritize and make a recommendation back to the full CRC to make a final decision, altering those recommendations as the full CRC sees fit.

Discussion, including:

We have 21 or 22 proposals, but some are recommendations, not amendments - recommendations are on a separate tab.

- Dick favors splitting them into two ballots.

Need to discuss with Randy how many of them can be consolidated.

- Kyle (chat): Sees value in having a key on our document that indicates degree they are substantive, whether they are amendments/recommendations/other and what priority the commission feels like each item should see.
- Maureen: Amendments now are too wordy.
- Randy: Prosecuting Attorney's office does not change the CRC's words. **Final submission to SJCC - analysis about timeline for that is needed.**
- Kevin: King County spread proposed amendments over two ballots, so there is precedent.
- Jane: Supports two ballots over two years. **Need Executive Committee to drill down into what edits can be made and bring that back.** Doesn't want to get into a discussion of starting to take stuff off. We need to make all this digestible for the voters.
- Patty: Saw a lot of Charter review initiatives in other counties. Working under pressure can help. In favor of splitting the proposed amendments over two years.
- Dave A: Supports that, too. Supports a higher number - at least 6 per year - people can digest that. Recommendations to the SJCC won't be on the ballot – find out if SJCC can put those things on for a 3rd year.
- Tony: Thinks we can either split them or continue with all of them.
- Bob: Split over two years is a good idea. We have two types of elections - one is a "small election" in which people can concentrate more on Charter amendments, but probably fewer voters.

To Summarize the Motion:

Motion is to give the Executive Committee the responsibility of developing a list of our previously approved amendments and how many will go on the ballot and how many won't, and which ballot they go on (2021 or 2022), and they present their recommendations to the full CRC for final recommendation.

- Kevin: To clarify, as part of the motion, we would be approving that we're splitting it over two (possibly 3?) years.
- David D: Yes. We don't meet again before next week's town halls - we will want some clarification about what we're presenting in those.
- Kyle (chat): Have we established that the current Charter gives us this split up/extension authority?

Dick called the question.

Vote: 14 in favor 2 abstentions (Tony & Kyle) - **Motion carried.**

Kyle (chat): Do we see a means during the Town Halls to pose a straw poll to the public for their tolerance around a 2-year vote split? Is waiting the extra week + too long?

(b) Discussion of Town Hall process:

Kevin asked if someone else like to chair the town halls. (No one responded.)

(Kevin had to jump off meeting)

Discussion re town halls continued post-public comment:

- Olivia: Kevin will likely do all the speaking, but committee leads should be prepared to speak just in case.
- Dick: The way we did it last time worked - Kevin just did it from the slide deck - held to 15-17 minutes, so maximum time goes to public comment.
- David D: Agrees with Dick. Suggests that Kevin introduce the CRC members at the beginning.
- Jane: Important that the public understanding the mechanics of how we've been operating - number of meetings, committees, people on those committees - have one, maybe two, slides at the front end that show this info so people have a sense of how hard we've worked over these past few months.
- Olivia: That's a fantastic idea. Suggested that each committee head share.
- Patty: Just a slide is sufficient - maybe a slide with the amendments from each committee. Others agreed.
- Kevin recommended that the Executive Committee come up with a brief scenario of the subcommittees, issues worked on, and what we're putting forward.

Further discussion:

- Kyle: Anticipate public questions that come up.
- **Maureen can make the amendment language much more succinct and use the summary as a backup for why it's there.**
- How to limit dialogue during the town halls.
- Maureen: Know what materials are going to be on the website - summaries, this table - this will answer a lot for people.
- **Kevin will work with Megan for a summarization, not just an Excel spreadsheet.**
- Sharon (chat): Publicize the town halls by email and social media.

- Bob: We need to know how to answer people's questions. We can give the email addresses for them to email us with any questions/comments they want responses to.
- Kevin: Preamble should include the email address of the full CRC that people can send questions/comments to. Hopes subcommittee leads will take on the issues brought up - sign as yourself, not representing the full CRC - really important.
- Olivia: We'll receive a blast email to send out to publicize the town halls.

7. Open for Public Comment

Carl de Boer (Orcas): Totally impressed by our dedication and the details we looked out - we're doing a wonderful job for all of us sitting and watching us, and for good democracy.

Steve Ulvi (SJI): He's gaining confidence in this process and in the amendments.

1. Was in many contentious public meetings in Alaska. Hopes that, if someone makes a statement embedded with erroneous/nonfactual info, that we will address that right there in the moment.

2. Important for people who haven't sat through our meetings, that at the beginning we give a quick summary of what's going forward from these town halls on - just a synopsis to give people an idea of the flow - that there's still a lot of listening to be done.

Alexandra Gayek (Orcas): Agrees with Carl & Steve. Would like to hear CRC members' responses to public questions/comments - a way we're talking to each other and we get to hear each other. Is there a way, after everything is solidified, to do a town hall with the purpose of responding to questions, so others can hear the answers? Some people would read the full content of the amendments as working documents on the website. Please put them on the website in advance of meetings so the public can make relevant comments/questions.

Ben Bama (SJI): Thanked us all. Looks like it's all coming together. Could there be a separate public comment portion and a separate Q&A portion in the town halls?

8. New Business (continued)

2. What issues might we want to revisit?

Kevin wants a sense from folks on this. Elected Qualifications is one issue - to bring up individual motions for each office. Got requests to revisit this.

Discussion, including.

- Maureen is uncomfortable with the tourism vote - can we bring that back?
- Motion by Bob to consider revisiting minimum qualifications for the Auditor. No second. Motion failed.

(David D left the meeting)

- Jane: Not clear where we stand on this issue and the RCV issue?
- Kevin: RCV was voted on, and the motion to add it as an amendment to the Charter and implement it the moment it's authorized at the state level carried. So that will be a proposal going forward.

- Olivia: See the Prosecuting Attorney's email with Robert's Rules of Order. It clearly confirms that it's a 2/3 majority of those CRC members present and voting at the meeting when the vote takes place, not the full CRC.

Kevin asked Megan & Kathryn to attend the first Executive Committee meeting tomorrow if possible.

Olivia: The qualifications proposals can be brought back as separate motions.

Kevin: We can say at the town halls that this is still under discussion.

ADJOURNMENT: Adjourned at 12:29pm

Sharon Abreu
CRC Member

Minutes were approved by consensus at the May 31, 2021 SPECIAL Meeting